

App. No. 10/706,234  
Attorney Docket No. 3055.2.1 NP

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 21 2007

**Remarks**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. In particular, Applicant thanks the interview teleconference on March 21, 2007; wherein the Applicant and Examiner discussed the current office action and ways in which to clarify and distinguish the Applicant's invention from the cited art.

With regards to the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, Claims 1-7, and 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Stanfield in view of Vivadelli et al..

In response, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9, 11, 15, 1 and 16, canceled Claims 5, 8, 10, 12, 16-17, 19-20, and added Claims 21-27. Support for the foregoing amendments may be found in Paragraphs 64, 60, 61, 75, and the claims and specification as previously presented. Accordingly, the Applicant believes no new matter has been added.

In response to the current office action, specifically, the Applicant has amended 1, 11, and added Claim 25 to include the limitation of an identification tag and a sensor which is configured to detect prearranged reservation. Neither Stanfield, nor Vivadelli teach the use of identification tags and/or sensors. Support for this amendment may be found in paragraph 60. Additionally, the Applicant has amended the disclosed Claims to include a membership module. Support for this may be found in paragraph 75. The membership module, together with the identification tag, enables a member to simply drive up to a kiosk, have the sensor read and recognize the member information and quickly enable a user to go to a preferred rental spot.

App. No. 10/706,234  
Attorney Docket No. 3055.2.1 NP

In response to the current office action, the Applicant reiterates and incorporates the argument of the previous action herein by reference. As disclosed in the previous actions, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with combining Stanfield and Vivadelli. In addition to the previous arguments, the applicant believes the references teach away from the combination. Specifically, Stanfield teaches away from using an automated system. The teaching in Stanfield is directed toward a more personal, attended service rather than an automated system that would allow for an impersonal check-in and check-out. Indeed, paragraph 40 teaches when a user is unable to receive or send email, he or she can use fax through the system. Additionally, all of the exemplary embodiments disclose a system wherein the user meets and checks-in with personal attendants (paragraphs 99-122). Further, Stanfield is directed toward a system that contacts the traveler, rather than the traveler initiating contact through a system such as a kiosk.

It is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendments, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

App. No. 10/706,234  
Attorney Docket No. 3055.2.1 NP

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael W. Starkweather  
Registration No. 34,441  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 21, 2007

Advantia Law Group  
Starkweather and Associates  
9035 South 1300 East  
Suite 200  
Sandy, Utah 84094  
Telephone: 801/272-8368